

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are pending, with Claims 1, 9 and 17-20 being independent.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ainai* (U.S. patent no. 5,663,800 to Ainai), in view of *Nishiyama* (U.S. patent no. 6,067,168 to Nishiyama et al.).

Claim 1 recites an imaging forming apparatus incorporating no image memory. An input device receives image data as an input. A transfer portion transfers the image data received by the input device to an image memory of a memory-incorporating apparatus via a network. A key generates a memory recall signal in response to operation of the key by a user after a transfer of the image data received by the input device to the image memory of the memory-incorporating apparatus connected to the input device via the network. A reception portion receives the image data stored in the image memory in accordance with the signal generated by the key in response to an operation by the user. A printing device forms an image with the use of the image data that is received by the reception means.

Ainai is relied upon to disclose all of Claim 1, except a key for "generating a signal and a reception means for receiving the image data stored it the image memory in accordance with the signal." For a disclosure of that, *Nishiyama* is relied upon.

However, *Nishiyama* does not disclose the claimed key as now clarified in the foregoing amendments. *Nishiyama* discloses a series of printers, including copy

machine 91. Image data is input into the memory of the copy machine 91. If the selected image processing command, e.g., a sharpness function (column 15, line 48), is not available, then the image data is sent to another copy machine, e.g., copy machine 92 or 93, which is capable of the sharpness function (column 16, lines 4-7). Thus, if the user selects the sharpness function with the setting keys on the copy machine 91, the image data is transmitted to one of the copy machines 92 or 93 from the copy machine 91. Once the image data is in the copy machine 92 or 93, it is processed using the sharpness function. Upon completion of the processing, and when the copy machine 91 is empty, ***the copy machine 91 automatically issues a return request and the copy machine 92 or 93 returns the processed image data to the copy machine 91 for printing.***

There is no disclosure in *Nishiyama* that the above-described return request is generated by operation of a key by a user ***after a transfer of the image data*** received by the input device to the image memory of the memory-incorporating apparatus connected to the input device via the network, as now recited in Claim 1. The image data is returned automatically, and not upon the reception by the copiers 92 or 93 of a signal generated by a key in response to operation by a user at the copier 91 ***after a transfer of the image data***. Therefore, it cannot be said that *Nishiyama* discloses or suggests a key that generates a signal in response to operation by a user after a transfer of the image data received by the input device to the image memory of the memory-incorporating apparatus connected to the input device via the network, and that the image data is transferred from the image memory in the memory-incorporating apparatus to a reception portion for receiving

image data via the network in accordance with the signal that was generated in response to an operation by the user.

Also, *Ainai* does not disclose a key as recited in the claims, and is not relied on for a disclosure of such in the Office action.

For at least those reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 based on *Ainai* in view of *Nishiyama*.

Claims 9 and 17-20 are allowable for similar reasons as Claim 1.

The rejections of the dependent claims should be withdrawn at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims.

For the reasons stated above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and such is requested.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 24, 2007

By: William C. Rowland

William C. Rowland

Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620